

"Are You a Victim of Ad Hominem New-Age Terminologies"

Term 1: Homophobe

Author: Abu Ameenah

Have you ever been labelled as a 'fundamentalist' due to your uncompromising attitude and rigid adherence to the pure teachings of Islam? Have you ever been a victim of the term 'homophobe' because you object to homosexual behaviour, despite your position being principled disagreement? Have you ever been described as a 'Moderate Muslim' by a non-Muslim or a fellow Muslim on the mere basis that you oppose many of the innovated principles found in various extremist groups? What do these terms truly represent? To what extent do they shape the thoughts of those who hurl them and to what degree do they affect their victims psychologically?

In our opinion, terms such as 'homophobe' or 'fundamentalist' are not coined to triangulate a truism, rather they are coined to arm the ignorant and gullible masses with *ad hominem* verbal weapons to character assassinate anyone who challenges manufactured social norms. Many of us undermine the power of wordplay and its detrimental psychological effects it can have on an individual or on a whole society. The point of a well crafted word can plunge deep into a man's mental tissue, leaving scars which may last for life. Thus, the metonymic adage '*the pen is mightier than the sword*' carries a truism which is given little significance by today's majority of confused souls. Most would prefer to invest conviction in that '*sticks and stones may break your bones but names will never hurt me.*' However, this myth should never be allowed to leave the provinces of nursery rhyme abode, because names do hurt and names do have the capability to completely undermine a person and his arguments, resulting in placing their victims in well defined pejorative boxes.

This paper will undertake the challenge to question the validity and usage of five of the most notorious new-age terminologies currently in circulation today. We will endeavour to dissect the anatomy of these terms and expose them for what they truly are and for what they actually represent.

NOTOURIOUS NAME # 1: HOMOPHOB

Many of these new-age terms in circulation today have been conscientiously reinterpreted with an aim to marginalise anyone who opposes today's flavour of moral relativism - justifying their existence on the sole virtue that they outwardly resemble the words they were once derived from. A classic example of this is the undisputed champion of ad hominem concocted terms "homophobia", which is conveniently defined as: "*the unreasoning fear of or antipathy toward homosexuals and homosexuality.*" So they bond the prefix 'homo' to the clinical term 'phobia', then provide for it a convenient definition and hey presto! Out of two chaste words a third word is illegally begotten and then employed like a verbal warhead to deploy on their ideological battlefields, which range from the broadsheets and tabloid newspapers, websites, books and television.

Let us look at the basic definition again of 'homophobia' and try and spot the operative word in its description: "*the unreasoning fear of or antipathy toward homosexuals and homosexuality.*" Have you spotted it? The effective term is 'unreasoning' and this word single-handedly provides the paste to smooth over the cracks of the two disjointed words (homo/phobia). So crucial to its definition is the word 'unreasoning' that if it were removed, it would simultaneously cause

the collapse of its whole definition and any relation to a phobia. Therefore, let us now move on and analyse the definition of a phobia.

WHAT IS A PHOBIA?

The word phobia denotes: "*a persistent, irrational fear of a specific object, activity, or situation that leads to a compelling desire to avoid it.*" For instance, some people have an abnormal fear of heights (acrophobia), others have an abnormal fear of spiders (arachnophobia), and others have an abnormal fear of water (aquaphobia). People experience these phobias despite there being little or no imminent threat, and along with these phobias certain symptoms are commonly diagnosed:

- ✓ Heart palpitations/dry mouth/shaking
- ✓ Excessive sweating
- ✓ Losing control over emotions
- ✓ Hyperventilation
- ✓ Hyperactive bowels

So after defining the basic definition of a phobia, along with mentioning some of its symptoms, we now need to ask: what makes someone who has an aversion towards homosexuality to be diagnosed as someone who has an acute bout of homophobia?

ARE YOU A HOMOPHOBES?!

It is an undisputed fact that a man who fears a bath tub half full of water will be hard-pressed to rationally articulate why he feels such a strong aversion towards this small quantity of liquid substance. He knows it is next to impossible for him to be a victim of its small amount, but in the face of this undeniable logic, he still suffers from an irrational bout of fear which forces him to avoid water. Is this a shared case for the Muslim or non-Muslim who hates homosexuality or a homosexual? Do you display any of the above mentioned symptoms when you find yourself in close proximity with a homosexual, regardless if he's of a diminutive stature?! Do you need to be reassured or made aware frequently that homosexuals do not present an imminent threat to your life? Are you really an individual who hunts down homosexuals and even murders them because you believe that they present a clear and present danger to your persons? Like us, we are sure your answers will be of a negative response, because like us, you do not display a single symptom or feel overwhelmed with any form of irrational fear. So what then is the real designated role and purpose for the word 'homophobe'?

WHAT HIDES BEHIND THE MASK OF THE TERM 'HOMOPHOBES'

The reality is the word 'homophobe' plays as a double-edged sword which in one fell swoop legitimises and naturalises homosexuality in the minds of the ignorant masses, and in the same devastating stroke it marginalises and alienates anyone who feels a natural aversion towards this despicable practice. The word 'homophobe' carries an inherent condemnation (similar in impact to the words 'sexist', 'racist' or 'anti-Semitic',) which miraculously, empower the ignorant with a single sound-bite defence mechanism which can be used to seek refuge behind when a supporter of homosexual rights can no longer argue his position in favour of homosexuality.

So what psychological impact does this word have on its target? On impact, you feel the force of its blast, which instantly places you on the back foot, compelling you to declare desperately, "No, I'm not a homophobe!" Alas, unwittingly, right there and then you have become a victim of a concocted word which has been artificially inseminated into the womb of language with the sole purpose of branding anyone who dares to disagree with today's retarded standards of moral relativity. The word 'homophobe' intimidates its victims like a school yard bully, preventing anyone from expressing his true feelings against homosexuality. This metaphorical muzzle aids tremendously in perpetuating the myth of homosexuality being an accepted norm amid the masses. Therefore, when enough have accepted this imaginary axiom and the norm is replaced with the abnormal (due to numbers and not nature), then the fruits of opportunity will be ripe for pro-homosexual activists to lobby for its criminalisation.

A few sentences above, we used the word 'hate' as opposed to 'fear' and this is because we do not feel comfortable with the word 'fear' and its implications. We agree that the words 'hate' and 'fear' can be two dominoes which may directly affect each other, but when isolated and defined on their own virtue they carry independent meanings. If I say, "I hate fish," it doesn't necessitate that I fear fish. This is a very important observation, because the advocates of the word 'homophobia' will have us believe that due to a 'fear' of our own undeveloped 'homosexual tendencies' this leads us to develop an irrational 'fear' for homosexuality. Strangely, they would never apply this reasoning to someone who hates incest, paedophilia or necrophilia, rather they would just state that his hatred is a natural defence mechanism which surfaces in the face of such abnormal acts. Therefore, never would you see the terms 'paedophobe' or 'incestophobe' coined as a clinical term and applied to anyone who feels a congenital hatred towards these acts, because this would result in the majority of the world's population being clear-cut candidates for being labelled as incestophobes or paedophobes!

'HOMOPHOBE' FOR THE BAD GUYS AND 'GAY' FOR THE GOOD GUYS

What happened to the good old idiom of *'let's call a spade a spade'*? In other words, why the need to name an individual who performs this alleged natural act (i.e. homosexuality) with names which conceal his reality (i.e. gay)? Is this a practise we usually employ? Do we think of flowery names for someone who commits murder, rape or incest? Would you consider calling someone who commits incest with euphemistic terms such as 'jovial' or 'congenial'? Or would you just prefer to uphold the term 'incest' as a direct reminder of his repugnant crime? Euphemisms hide unpleasant and disturbing ideas – is this not the case for the misplaced word 'gay'? The term 'gay' is a product of psychobabble used for misdirection, obfuscating a reality through extraneous classification.

CONCLUSION

It is said, "Attack is the best form of defence," and in light of this concocted term 'homophobia' we whole-heartedly agree. So the next time someone calls you a homophobe, demand from its indoctrinated enthusiast to explain its coherent definition and how it applies to you and your inherent aversion towards homosexuality. This will inevitably reverse the tables and cause him to shoulder the burden of first justifying its usage in language and then proving how this term adequately applies to you. In most cases, the person will not be able to articulate his case when defending the term 'homophobia' because, as proven above, the word holds little grasp on reality. Let us not forget that the word 'homophobia' also implies that homosexuality is hardwired genetically and that the 'gay gene' has long been discovered. This is what pseudo science will have us believe.

However, when one looks behind the scenes of this immoral agenda, masquerading as science, it will become quite easy to discover that there is no such thing as a 'gay gene'.¹

[Oct 15th 2009]

¹ Sociologist Steven Goldberg, Ph.D.: "Virtually all of the evidence argues against there being a determinative physiological causal factor and I know of no researcher who believes that such a *determinative* factor exists...such factors play a *predisposing*, not a determinative role...I know of no one in the field who argues that homosexuality can be explained without reference to environmental factors."

One of Jeffrey Satinover's conclusions in "The Gay Gene": There is no evidence that shows that homosexuality is genetic--**and none of the research itself claims there is**. Only the press and certain researchers do, when speaking in sound bites to the public." (Jeffrey Satinover, M.D., *The Journal of Human Sexuality*, 1996, p.8.)

Simon LeVay, the author of the hypothalamus study, noted, "It's important to stress what I didn't find. I did not prove that homosexuality was genetic, or find a genetic cause for being gay. I didn't show that gay men were born that way, the most common mistake people make in interpreting my work" (Nimmons, 1994, p. 64).

LeVay, the gay activist researcher, made an interesting observation about the emphasis on the biology of homosexuality: He noted, "...people who think that gays and lesbians are born that way are also more likely to support gay rights" (1996, p. 282).